

Case 2:15-cr-04268-JB Document 2173 Filed 04/27/18 Page 1 of 14

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

No. CR 15-4268 JB

ANGEL DELEON, JOE LAWRENCE
GALLEGOS, EDWARD TROUP, a.k.a.
"Huero Troup," LEONARD LUJAN,
BILLY GARCIA, a.k.a. "Wild Bill,"
EUGENE MARTINEZ, a.k.a. "Little
Guero," ALLEN PATTERSON,
CHRISTOPHER CHAVEZ, a.k.a. "Critter,"
JAVIER ALONSO, a.k.a. "Wineo,"
ARTURO ARNULFO GARCIA, a.k.a.
"Shotgun," BENJAMIN CLARK, a.k.a.
"Cyclone," RUBEN HERNANDEZ;
JERRY ARMENTA, a.k.a. "Creeper,"
JERRY MONTOYA, a.k.a. "Boxer,"
MARIO RODRIGUEZ, a.k.a. "Blue,"
TIMOTHY MARTINEZ, a.k.a. "Red,"
MAURICIO VARELA, a.k.a. "Archie,"
a.k.a. "Hog Nuts," DANIEL SANCHEZ,
a.k.a. "Dan Dan," GERALD ARCHULETA,
a.k.a. "Styx," a.k.a. "Grandma," CONRAD
VILLEGAS, a.k.a. "Chitmon," ANTHONY
RAY BACA, a.k.a. "Pup," ROBERT
MARTINEZ, a.k.a. "Baby Rob," ROY
PAUL MARTINEZ, a.k.a. "Shadow,"
CHRISTOPHER GARCIA, CARLOS
HERRERA, a.k.a. "Lazy," RUDY PEREZ,
a.k.a. "Ru Dog," ANDREW GALLEGOS,
a.k.a. "Smiley," SANTOS GONZALEZ;
PAUL RIVERA, SHAUNA GUTIERREZ,
and BRANDY RODRIGUEZ,

Defendants.

COURT'S FIRST PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS
(with citations)

JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 1

Members of the Jury:

In any jury trial there are, in effect, two judges. I am one of the judges, you are the other. I am the judge of the law. You, as jurors, are the judges of the facts. I presided over the trial and decided what evidence was proper for your consideration. It is also my duty at the end of the trial to explain to you the rules of law that you must follow and apply in arriving at your verdict.

In explaining the rules of law that you must follow, first, I will give you some general instructions which apply in every criminal case -- for example, instructions about burden of proof and insights that may help you to judge the believability of witnesses. Then I will give you some specific rules of law that apply to this particular case and, finally, I will explain the procedures you should follow in your deliberations, and the possible verdicts you may return. These instructions will be given to you for use in the jury room, so you need not take notes.

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS, **UNITED STATES' PROPOSED JURY**
INSTRUCTION NO. 1, at 1, 2, filed March 3, 2018 (Doc. 1966)

Criminal Pattern Jury Instruction Committee of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, **CRIMINAL PATTERN JURY INSTRUCTIONS** 1.03, at i, 7 (2011 Edition Updated February, 2018)(INTRODUCTION TO FINAL INSTRUCTIONS)

No bold

Case 2:15-cr-04268-JB Document 2173 Filed 04/27/18 Page 3 of 14

JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 2

You, as jurors, are the judges of the facts. But in determining what actually happened -- that is, in reaching your decision as to the facts -- it is your sworn duty to follow all of the rules of law as I explain them to you.

You have no right to disregard or give special attention to any one instruction, or to question the wisdom or correctness of any rule I may state to you. You must not substitute or follow your own notion or opinion as to what the law is or ought to be. It is your duty to apply the law as I explain it to you, regardless of the consequences. However, you should not read into these instructions, or anything else I may have said or done, any suggestion as to what your verdict should be. That is entirely up to you.

It is also your duty to base your verdict solely upon the evidence, without prejudice or sympathy. That was the promise you made and the oath you took.

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS, UNITED STATES' PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 2, at 1, 3, filed March 3, 2018 (Doc. 1966)

Criminal Pattern Jury Instruction Committee of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, **CRIMINAL PATTERN JURY INSTRUCTIONS** 1.04, at i, 8 (2011 Edition Updated February, 2018)(DUTY TO FOLLOW INSTRUCTIONS)

Case 2:15-cr-04268-JB Document 2173 Filed 04/27/18 Page 4 of 14

JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 3

The government has the burden of proving defendants Joe Lawrence Gallegos, Edward Troup, Billy Garcia, Allen Patterson, Christopher Chavez, Arturo Arnulfo Garcia, and Andrew Gallegos, ~~guilty~~ beyond a reasonable doubt. The law does not require Mr. Joe Lawrence Gallegos, Mr. Troup, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Arturo Arnulfo Garcia, and Mr. Andrew Gallegos to prove his innocence or produce any evidence at all. The government has the burden of proving Mr. Joe Lawrence Gallegos, Mr. Troup, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Arturo Arnulfo Garcia, and Mr. Andrew Gallegos guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, and if it fails to do so, you must find Mr. Joe Lawrence Gallegos, Mr. Troup, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Arturo Arnulfo Garcia, and Mr. Andrew Gallegos not guilty.

Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof that leaves you firmly convinced of Mr. Joe Lawrence Gallegos', Mr. Troup's, Mr. Billy Garcia's, Mr. Patterson's, Mr. Chavez', Mr. Arturo Arnulfo Garcia's, and Mr. Andrew Gallegos' guilt. There are few things in this world that we know with absolute certainty, and in criminal cases the law does not require proof that overcomes every possible doubt. It is only required that the government's proof exclude any "reasonable doubt" concerning Mr. Joe Lawrence Gallegos', Mr. Troup's, Mr. Billy Garcia's, Mr. Patterson's, Mr. Chavez', Mr. Arturo Arnulfo Garcia's, and Mr. Andrew Gallegos' guilt. A reasonable doubt is a doubt based on reason and common sense after careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence in the case. If, based on your consideration of the evidence, you are firmly convinced that Mr. Joe Lawrence Gallegos, Mr. Troup, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Arturo Arnulfo Garcia, and Mr. Andrew Gallegos is guilty of the crime charged, you must find him guilty. If on the other hand, you think there is a real

- ✓ possibility that Mr. Joe Lawrence Gallegos, Mr. Troup, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr.
- ✓ Chavez, Mr. Arturo Amulfo Garcia, and Mr. Andrew Gallegos is not guilty, you must give him the benefit of the doubt and find Mr. Joe Lawrence Gallegos, Mr. Troup, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Arturo Amulfo Garcia, and Mr. Andrew Gallegos not guilty.

Mr. Joe Gallegos,
Mr. Troup, Mr.
Billy Garcia, Mr.
Patterson, Mr. Chavez,
Mr. Arturo Garcia,
and Mr. Andrew Gallegos,

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS, UNITED STATES' PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 3, at 1, 4, filed March 3, 2018 (Doc. 1966)(modified)

Criminal Pattern Jury Instruction Committee of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, **CRIMINAL PATTERN JURY INSTRUCTIONS** 1.05, at ii, 9 (2011 Edition Updated February, 2018) (PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE -- BURDEN OF PROOF-REASONABLE DOUBT)(adopted)

Case 2:15-cr-04268-JB Document 2173 Filed 04/27/18 Page 6 of 14

JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 4

You must make your decision based only on the evidence that you saw and heard here in court. Do not let rumors, suspicions, or anything else that you may have seen or heard outside of court influence your decision in any way.

The evidence in this case includes only what the witnesses said while they were testifying under oath, the exhibits that I allowed into evidence, and the stipulations that the lawyers agreed to.

Nothing else is evidence. The lawyers' statements and arguments are not evidence. Their questions and objections are not evidence. My legal rulings are not evidence. And my comments and questions are not evidence.

During the trial, I did not let you hear the answers to some of the questions that the lawyers asked. I also ruled that you could not see some of the exhibits that the lawyers wanted you to see. And sometimes I ordered you to disregard things that you saw or heard, or I struck things from the record. You must completely ignore all of these things. Do not even think about them. Do not speculate about what a witness might have said or what an exhibit might have shown. These things are not evidence, and you are bound by your oath not to let them influence your decision in any way.

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS, UNITED STATES' PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 4, at 1, 5, filed March 3, 2018 (Doc. 1966)(modified)

Criminal Pattern Jury Instruction Committee of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, **CRIMINAL PATTERN JURY INSTRUCTIONS** 1.06, at i, 11 (2011 Edition Updated February, 2018)(EVIDENCE -- DEFINED) (adapted)

JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 5

There are, generally speaking, two types of evidence from which a jury may properly determine the facts of a case. One is direct evidence, such as the testimony of an eyewitness. The other is indirect or circumstantial evidence, that is, the proof of a chain of facts which point to the existence or non-existence of certain other facts.

As a general rule, the law makes no distinction between direct and circumstantial evidence. The law simply requires that you find the facts in accord with all the evidence in the case, both direct and circumstantial.

While you must consider only the evidence in this case, you are permitted to draw reasonable inferences from the testimony and exhibits, inferences you feel are justified in the light of common experience. An inference is a conclusion that reason and common sense may lead you to draw from facts which have been proved.

By permitting such reasonable inferences, you may make deductions and reach conclusions that reason and common sense lead you to draw from the facts which have been established by the testimony and evidence in this case.

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS, UNITED STATES' PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 5, at 1, 6, filed March 3, 2018 (Doc. 1966)

Criminal Pattern Jury Instruction Committee of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, **CRIMINAL PATTERN JURY INSTRUCTIONS 1.07**, at i, 13 (2011 Edition Updated February, 2018)

United States v. DeLeon, et al (15-4268), Trial 1, Jury Instruction No. 6

No bull

Shot A

- 7 -

Shot B

Boel

Sheet 4

cell up / Bud / Wm

cell up /
BL

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS

UNITED

STATES' PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 10

at 6, 12, & 17 Maj 23, 2018 (Dec 1966)
(modified)

Sheet B

Third Circuit Pattern Jury Instructions Criminal 4.3 (2017) (Consciousness of Guilt -Flight, Concealment, Use of an Alias, etc.)

JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 6

I remind you that it is your job to decide whether the government has proved the guilt of
 ✓ Mr. Joe ~~Lawrence~~⁹ Gallegos, Mr. Troup, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Arturo
 ✓ ~~Arnulfo~~ Garcia, and Mr. Andrew Gallegos beyond a reasonable doubt. In doing so, you must
 consider all of the evidence. This does not mean, however, that you must accept all of the
 evidence as true or accurate.

You are the sole judges of the credibility or "believability" of each witness and the
 weight to be given to the witness's testimony. An important part of your job will be making
 judgments about the testimony of the witnesses [including Mr. Joe ~~Lawrence~~⁹ Gallegos, Mr.
**Troup, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Arturo ~~Arnulfo~~ Garcia, and Mr.
 Andrew Gallegos**] who testified in this case. You should think about the testimony of each
 witness you have heard and decide whether you believe all or any part of what each witness had
 to say, and how important that testimony was. In making that decision, I suggest that you ask
 yourself a few questions: Did the witness impress you as honest? Did the witness have any
 particular reason not to tell the truth? Did the witness have a personal interest in the outcome in
 this case? Did the witness have any relationship with either the government or Mr. Joe
 ✓ ~~Lawrence~~ Gallegos, Mr. Troup, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Arturo
 ✓ ~~Arnulfo~~ Garcia, and Mr. Andrew Gallegos? Did the witness seem to have a good memory? Did
 the witness clearly see or hear the things about which he/she testified? Did the witness have the
 opportunity and ability to understand the questions clearly and answer them directly? Did the
 witness's testimony differ from the testimony of other witnesses? When weighing the conflicting
 testimony, you should consider whether the discrepancy has to do with a material fact or with an
 unimportant detail. And you should keep in mind that innocent misrecollection -- like failure of

recollection -- is not uncommon. Bd

[The testimony of Mr. Joe Lawrence Gallegos, Mr. Troup, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Arturo Arnulfo Garcia, and Mr. Andrew Gallegos should be weighed and their credibility evaluated in the same way as that of any other witness.]

[Mr. Joe Lawrence Gallegos, Mr. Troup, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Arturo Arnulfo Garcia, and Mr. Andrew Gallegos did not testify and I remind you that you cannot consider their decision not to testify as evidence of guilt. I want you to clearly understand, please, that the Constitution of the United States grants to a defendant the right to remain silent. That means the right not to testify or call any witnesses. That is a constitutional right in this country, it is very carefully guarded, and you should understand that no presumption of guilt may be raised and no inference of any kind may be drawn from the fact that Mr. Joe Lawrence Gallegos, Mr. Troup, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Arturo Arnulfo Garcia, and Mr. Andrew Gallegos does not take the witness stand and testify or call any witnesses.]

In reaching a conclusion on particular point, or ultimately in reaching a verdict in this case, do not make any decisions simply because there were more witnesses on one side than on the other.

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS, UNITED STATES' PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 6, at 1, 7-8, filed March 3, 2018 (Doc. 1966)(modified) Bd

Criminal Pattern Jury Instruction Committee of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, **CRIMINAL PATTERN JURY INSTRUCTIONS** 1.08, at i, 8 (2011 Edition Updated February, 2018)(CREDIBILITY OF WITNESSES) (adapt)

JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 7

You have heard the testimony of [name of witness]. You have also heard that, before this trial, he made a statement that may be different from his testimony here in court.

This earlier statement was brought to your attention only to help you decide how believable his testimony in this trial was. You cannot use it as proof of anything else. You can only use it as one way of evaluating his testimony here in court.

Bald

2

Bald

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS, INSTRUCTION NO. 7, at 1, 9, filed March 3, 2018 (Doc. 1966)(modified) UNITED STATES' PROPOSED JURY

Criminal Pattern Jury Instruction Committee of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, **CRIMINAL PATTERN JURY INSTRUCTIONS** 1.10, at i, 21 (**2011 Edition Updated February, 2018**)(IMPEACHMENT BY PRIOR INCONSISTENCIES) *(adapt)*

No. 61

- 10 -

JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 8

You have heard evidence that Mr. Joe Lawrence Gallegos, Mr. Troup, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Arturo Arnulfo Garcia, and Mr. Andrew Gallegos have been convicted of a felony, that is, a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term of years. This conviction has been brought to your attention only because you may wish to consider it when you decide, as with any witness, how much of his testimony you will believe in this trial. The fact that Mr. Joe Lawrence Gallegos, Mr. Troup, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Arturo Arnulfo Garcia, and Mr. Andrew Gallegos have been convicted of another crime does not mean that he committed the crime charged in this case, and you must not use his prior conviction as proof of the crime charged in this case. You may find him guilty of the crime charged here only if the government has proved beyond a reasonable doubt that he committed it.

they

then

their

10
7
Bald

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS, UNITED STATES' PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 8 at 1, 3, filed March 3, 2018 (Doc. 1966)(modified)

Criminal Pattern Jury Instruction Committee of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, CRIMINAL PATTERN JURY INSTRUCTIONS 1.11, at i, 22 (2011 Edition Updated February, 2018)(IMPEACHMENT BY PRIOR CONVICTION (Defendant's Testimony))(adopted)

No. 11

JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 9

The testimony of a witness may be discredited or impeached by showing that the witness previously has been convicted of a **felony, that is, of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term of years or of a crime of dishonesty or false statement**. A prior conviction does not mean that a witness is not qualified to testify, but is merely one circumstance that you may consider in determining the credibility of the witness. You may decide how much weight to give **any prior felony conviction or crime of dishonesty** that was used to impeach a witness.

1 *Bell*
2
PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS, UNITED STATES' PROPOSED JURY
INSTRUCTION NO. 9, at 1, 12, filed March 3, 2018 (Doc. 1966)(modified)

Criminal Pattern Jury Instruction Committee of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, **CRIMINAL PATTERN JURY INSTRUCTIONS 1.12, at i, 23 (2011 Edition Updated February, 2018)**

Not
bl
United States v. DeLeon, et al (15-4268), Trial 1, Jury Instruction No. 10 (modified)

Case 2:15-cr-04268-JB Document 2173 Filed 04/27/18 Page 13 of 14

JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 10**Accomplice**

An accomplice is someone who joined with another person in committing a crime, voluntarily and with common intent. The testimony of an accomplice may be received in evidence and considered by you, even though it is not supported by other evidence. You may decide how much weight it should have.

You are to keep in mind, however, that accomplice testimony should be received with caution and considered with great care. You should not convict Mr. Joe Lawrence Gallegos, Mr. Troup, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Arturo Arnulfo Garcia, and Mr. Andrew Gallegos based on the unsupported testimony of an alleged accomplice, unless you believe the unsupported testimony beyond a reasonable doubt.

Informant

An informant is someone who provides evidence against someone else for a personal reason or advantage. The testimony of an informant alone, if believed by the jury, may be of sufficient weight to sustain a verdict of guilt, even though not corroborated or supported by other evidence. You must examine and weigh an informant's testimony with greater care than the testimony of an ordinary witness. You must determine whether the informant's testimony has been affected by self-interest, by an agreement he has with the government, by his own interest in the outcome of the case, or by prejudice against Mr. Joe Lawrence Gallegos, Mr. Troup, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Arturo Arnulfo Garcia, and Mr. Andrew Gallegos.

You should not convict Mr. Joe Lawrence Gallegos, Mr. Troup, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Arturo Arnulfo Garcia, and Mr. Andrew Gallegos based on the unsupported testimony of an informant, unless you believe the unsupported testimony beyond a reasonable doubt.

Immunity

A person may testify under a grant of immunity (an agreement with the government). His testimony alone, if believed by the jury, may be of sufficient weight to sustain a verdict of guilt even though it is not corroborated or supported by other evidence. You should consider testimony given under a grant of immunity with greater care and caution than the testimony of an ordinary witness. You should consider whether testimony under a grant of immunity has been affected by the witness's own interest, the government's agreement, the witness's interest in the outcome of the case, or by prejudice against Mr. Joe Lawrence Gallegos, Mr. Troup, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Arturo Arnulfo Garcia, and Mr. Andrew Gallegos.

On the other hand, you should also consider that an immunized witness can be prosecuted for perjury for making a false statement. After considering these things, you may give testimony given under a grant of immunity such weight as you find it deserves.

You should not convict Mr. Joe Lawrence Gallegos, Mr. Troup, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Arturo Arnulfo Garcia, and Mr. Andrew Gallegos based on the unsupported testimony of an immunized witness, unless you believe the unsupported testimony beyond a reasonable doubt.

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS, UNITED STATES' PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 11, at 1, 13-14 filed March 3, 2018 (Doc. 1966)(modified)

Criminal Pattern Jury Instruction Committee of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, **CRIMINAL PATTERN JURY INSTRUCTIONS** 1.14, at i, 25, 26 (2011 Edition Updated February, 2018)(ACCOMPLICE -- INFORMANT -- IMMUNITY [as appropriate])

United States v. DeLeon, et al (15-4268), Trial 1, Jury Instruction No. 12 (modified)

~~Case 2:15-cr-04268-JB Document 1966 Filed 03/23/18 Page 16 of 61~~

~~UNITED STATES' PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 13~~

The testimony of a drug abuser must be examined and weighed by the jury with greater caution than the testimony of a witness who does not abuse drugs.

[Name of witness] may be considered to be an abuser of drugs.

You must determine whether the testimony of that witness has been affected by the use of drugs or the need for drugs.

Tenth Circuit Pattern Jury Instructions Criminal 1.16 (2011) (Witness's Use of Addictive Drugs) (modified)

at i, 28,

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS

UNITED STATES' PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 13

at 31, 16, filed Mar 23, 2018 (Doc. 1966) (modified)

Entered by Clerk of Court 2018

judg mo

UNITED STATES' PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 12

Bald

The government has entered into a plea agreement with [Robert Martinez, etc....], providing for the possibility of a recommendation of a lesser sentence than he would otherwise likely receive. Plea bargaining is lawful and proper, and the rules of this Court expressly provide for it.

Am alleged accomplice, instead one

(the co-deft,)

J.c.

A person who has entered into a plea agreement with the government is not prohibited from testifying. On the contrary, ^{the} such testimony may, by itself, support a guilty verdict. You should receive this type of testimony with caution and weigh it with great care. You should never convict a defendant upon the unsupported testimony of such a witness, unless you believe that testimony beyond a reasonable doubt. The fact that the person has entered into a guilty plea to the offense charged is not evidence of the guilt of any other person.

an accomplice

(an alleged accomplice)

all up No Rd

Tenth Circuit Pattern Jury Instructions Criminal 1.15 (2011) (Accomplice-Co-Defendant Plea Agreement) (modified)

adaptd

at i, 27

--

--

The government called as one of its witnesses an alleged accomplice, who was named as a co-defendant in the indictment.

Red Editor light 7/11/2015

[e.g., for the dismissal of some charges and

Mr. Joe Sallegas, Mr. Trapp, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Chang, Mr. Arturo Garcia, at Mr. Sallegas

all up/Bald/

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS

¹⁵

UNITED STATES'

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 12, at 1, 15,

file 11/23, 2018 (Dec. 1966) (modified)

Civil Pattern Jury Instructions of 10th Cir. of App. of the 10th Cir.

Case 2:15-cr-04268-JB Document 1966 Filed 03/23/18 Page 17 of 61

Amely mo

UNITED STATES' PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 14

(During the trial you heard the testimony of who expressed opinions concerning) In some cases, such as this one, scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge may assist the jury in understanding the evidence or in determining a fact in issue. A witness who has knowledge, skill, experience, training or education, may testify and state an opinion concerning such matters.

You are not required to accept such an opinion. You should consider opinion testimony just as you consider other testimony in this trial. Give opinion testimony as much weight as you think it deserves, considering the education and experience of the witness, the soundness of the reasons given for the opinion, and other evidence in the trial.

Tenth Circuit Pattern Jury Instructions Criminal 1.17 (2011) (Expert Witnesses) (adph)

Criminal Pattern Jury Instructions Committee of the 10th Cir. Ct. of Appeals & the Tenth Cir.

at i, 29 *Bld* *Each* *No bl* *Updated Feb 2018*

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS,

UNITED STATES' PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 14

at 1, 17,
ft Mar 23, 2018 (Doc. 1966)
(modified)

all up
BH

Case 2:15-cr-04268-JB Document 1966 Filed 03/23/18 Page 18 of 61

UNITED STATES' PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 15

Evidence has been presented about a statement attributed to the defendant alleged to have been made after the commission of the crime (or crimes) charged in this case but not made in court. Such evidence should always be considered by you with caution and weighed with care. You should give any such statement the weight you think it deserves, after considering all the circumstances under which the statement was made.

In determining whether any such statement is reliable and credible, consider factors bearing on the voluntariness of the statement. For example, consider the age, gender, training, education, occupation, and physical and mental condition of the defendant, and any evidence concerning his treatment while under interrogation if the statement was made in response to questioning by government officials, and all the other circumstances in evidence surrounding the making of the statement.

After considering all this evidence, you may give such weight to the statement as you feel it deserves under all the circumstances. If you determine that the statement is unreliable or not credible, you may disregard the statement entirely.

Tenth Circuit Pattern Jury Instructions Criminal 1.25 (2011) (Voluntariness of Statements by Defendant)

(Single Deft.)

at 1, 38

Crim. Patts. for Instructions Committee of the U.S. Ct. of Appeals & the Tenth Ct.

Mr. Dallygo, Mr. Trang, Mr. Billy Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Arturo Garcia, and Mr. Andrew Dallygo

all ap / Ref. ltr.

-18-

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS

UNITED STATES' PROPOSED

JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 15

at 1, 12, 13

March 23, 2018 (Doc. 1966) (modified)


Case 2:15-cr-04268-JB Document 1966 Filed 03/23/18 Page 19 of 61

John M.

UNITED STATES' PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 16


During this trial, you have heard sound recordings of certain conversations. These conversations were legally recorded; they are a proper form of evidence and may be considered by you as you would any other evidence. You were also given transcripts of those recorded conversations.

Keep in mind that the transcripts are not evidence. They were given to you only as a guide to help you follow what was being said. The recordings themselves are the evidence. If you noticed any differences between what you heard on the recordings and what you read in the transcripts, you must rely on what you heard, not what you read. If you could not hear or understand certain parts of the recordings, you must ignore the transcript as far as those parts are concerned.



~~UNITED STATES' PROPOSED~~ JURY INSTRUCTION NO.

Certain charts and summaries have been shown to you to help explain the evidence in this case. Their only purpose is to help explain the evidence. These charts and summaries are not evidence or proof of any facts.




Case 2:15-cr-04268-JB Document 1966 Filed 03/23/18 Page 21 of 61

~~UNITED STATES' PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 18~~

The word "racketeering" has certain implications in our society. Use of that term in this statute and in this courtroom should not be regarded as having anything to do with your determination of whether the guilt of this defendant has been proven. The term is only a term used by Congress to describe the statute.

Tenth Circuit Pattern Jury Instructions Criminal 2.74.1 (2011) (Prejudice from the Word "Racketeering")



Case 2:15-cr-04268-JB Document 1966 Filed 03/23/18 Page 22 of 61

UNITED STATES PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 19

July

Counts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 14, and 15 of the Indictment charge specific defendants with committing violent crimes in aid of racketeering, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1959.

That law makes it a crime for any person who, as consideration for a promise or agreement to pay anything of pecuniary value from an enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, or for the purpose of gaining entrance to or maintaining or increasing position in an enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, murders, kidnaps, maims, assaults with a dangerous weapon, commits assault resulting in serious bodily injury upon, or threatens to commit a crime of violence against any individual in violation of the law of any State or the United States, or attempts or conspires so to do.

United States v. DeLeon, et al (15-4268), Trial 1, Jury Instruction No. 21

all cap / Bl / W

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS

UNITED STATES

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 19

at 1, 22, fl Mar 23, 2018 (Doc. 1366)

all up / B

~~Case 2:15-cr-04268-JB Document 1966 Filed 03/23/18 Page 23 of 61~~~~UNITED STATES PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO.~~~~20~~

Defendants ^(Mr.) Joe Lawrence Gallegos, ^(Mr.) Edward Troup, ^(Mr.) Billy Garcia, ^(Mr.) Allen Patterson, ^(Mr.) Christopher Chavez, ^(Mr.) Arturo Arnulfo Garcia, ^(Mr.) Andrew Gallegos, and ^(Mr.) Shauna Gutierrez are on trial

before you upon an Indictment brought by the Grand Jury. Before reading the indictment to you,

I remind you that the Indictment or formal charge against a defendant is not evidence of guilt.

Indeed, a defendant is presumed by the law to be innocent.

In this case, the Indictment charges as follows:

Count 1

Murder of Frank Castillo

On or about March 26, 2001, in Doña Ana County, in the District of New Mexico, as consideration for the receipt of, and as consideration for a promise and agreement to pay, anything of pecuniary value from the Sindicato de Nuevo Mexico Gang (SNM), or for the purpose of gaining entrance to or maintaining or increasing position in the Sindicato de Nuevo Mexico Gang (SNM), an enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, the defendants, ANGEL DELEON, JOE LAWRENCE GALLEGOS, EDWARD TROUP, a.k.a. "Huero Troup," LEONARD LUJAN, and BILLY GARCIA, a.k.a. "Wild Bill," did unlawfully, knowingly, and intentionally murder Frank Castillo, in violation of NMSA 1978, Sections 30-2-1 and 30-1-13.

All in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§1959(a)(1) and 2.

Count 2

Murder of Rolando Garza

On or about March 26, 2001, in Doña Ana County, in the District of New Mexico, as consideration for the receipt of, and as consideration for a promise and agreement to pay, anything of pecuniary value from the Sindicato de Nuevo Mexico Gang (SNM), or for the

- 23 -

~~Case 2:15-cr-04268-JB Document 1966 Filed 03/23/18 Page 24 of 61~~

purpose of gaining entrance to or maintaining or increasing position in the Sindicato de Nuevo Mexico Gang (SNM), an enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, the defendants, LEONARD LUJAN, **BILLY GARCIA, a.k.a. "Wild Bill,"** EUGENE MARTINEZ, a.k.a. "Little Guero," **ALLEN PATTERSON,** and **CHRISTOPHER CHAVEZ, a.k.a. "Critter,"** did unlawfully, knowingly, and intentionally murder Rolando Garza, in violation of NMSA 1978, Sections 30-2-1 and 30-1-13.

All in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1959(a)(1) and 2.

Count 3

Murder of Freddie Sanchez

On or about June 17, 2007, in Doña Ana County, in the District of New Mexico, as consideration for the receipt of, and as consideration for a promise and agreement to pay, anything of pecuniary value from the Sindicato de Nuevo Mexico Gang (SNM), or for the purpose of gaining entrance to or maintaining or increasing position in the Sindicato de Nuevo Mexico Gang (SNM), an enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, the defendants, JAVIER ALONSO, a.k.a. "Wineo," **EDWARD TROUP, a.k.a. "Huero Troup,"** **ARTURO ARNULFO GARCIA, a.k.a. "Shotgun,"** BENJAMIN CLARK, a.k.a. "Cyclone," and RUBEN HERNANDEZ, did unlawfully, knowingly, and intentionally murder Freddie Sanchez, in violation of NMSA 1978, Sections 30-2-1 and 30-1-13.

All in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1959(a)(1) and 2.

Count 4

Conspiracy to Murder Adrian Burns

In or about November 2012, in Socorro and Valencia Counties, in the District of New Mexico, and elsewhere, as consideration for the receipt of, and as consideration for a promise and agreement to pay, anything of pecuniary value from the Sindicato de Nuevo Mexico Gang

~~Case 2:15-cr-04268-JB Document 1966 Filed 03/23/18 Page 25 of 61~~

(SNM), or for the purpose of gaining entrance to or maintaining or increasing position in the Sindicato de Nuevo Mexico Gang (SNM), an enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, the defendants, **JOE LAWRENCE GALLEGOS** and **ANDREW GALLEGOS, a.k.a. "Smiley,"** and others known and unknown to the grand jury, did unlawfully, knowingly, and intentionally conspire to murder Adrian Burns, in violation of NMSA 1978, Sections 30-2-1 and 30-28-2.

All in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1959(a)(5).

Count 5

Murder of Adrian Burns

On or about November 12, 2012, in Socorro and Valencia Counties, in the District of New Mexico, and elsewhere, as consideration for the receipt of, and as consideration for a promise and agreement to pay, anything of pecuniary value from the Sindicato de Nuevo Mexico Gang (SNM), or for the purpose of gaining entrance to or maintaining or increasing position in the Sindicato de Nuevo Mexico Gang (SNM), an enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, the defendants, **JOE LAWRENCE GALLEGOS** and **ANDREW GALLEGOS, a.k.a. "Smiley,"** did unlawfully, knowingly and intentionally murder Adrian Burns, in violation of NMSA 1978, Sections 30-2-1 and 30-1-13.

All in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1959(a)(1) and 2.

Count 13

Assault With a Dangerous Weapon Upon Jose Gomez

On or about March 17, 2015, in Valencia County, in the District of New Mexico, as consideration for the receipt of, and as consideration for a promise and an agreement to pay, anything of pecuniary value from the Sindicato de Nuevo Mexico Gang (SNM), or for the purpose of gaining entrance to or maintaining or increasing position in the Sindicato de Nuevo Mexico Gang (SNM), an enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, the defendant, **JOE**

~~Case 2:15-cr-04268-JB Document 1966 Filed 03/23/18 Page 26 of 61~~

LAWRENCE GALLEGOS, did unlawfully, knowingly, and intentionally commit assault with a dangerous weapon against Jose Gomez, in violation of NMSA 1978, §§ 30-3-2 and 30-1-13.

All in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1959(a)(3) and 2.

Count 14

Conspiracy to Murder Jose Gomez

On or about February 1, 2016, to on or about February 27, 2016, in Otero and Valencia Counties, in the District of New Mexico, as consideration for the receipt of, and as consideration for a promise and an agreement to pay, anything of pecuniary value from the Sindicato de Nuevo Mexico Gang (SNM), or for the purpose of gaining entrance to or maintaining or increasing position in the Sindicato de Nuevo Mexico Gang (SNM), an enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, the defendants, **JOE LAWRENCE GALLEGOS**, **SANTOS GONZALEZ**, **PAUL RIVERA**, **SHAUNA GUTIERREZ** and **BRANDY RODRIGUEZ**, and others known and unknown to the grand jury, did unlawfully, knowingly and intentionally conspire to murder Jose Gomez, in violation of NMSA 1978, §§ 30-2-1 and 30-28-2. All in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1959(a)(5).

Count 15

Attempted Murder of Jose Gomez, Assault With a Dangerous Weapon Upon Jose Gomez

Resulting in Serious Bodily Injury to Jose Gomez

On or about February 27, 2016, in Valencia County, in the District of New Mexico, as consideration for the receipt of, and as consideration for a promise and an agreement to pay, anything of pecuniary value from the Sindicato de Nuevo Mexico Gang (SNM), or for the purpose of gaining entrance to or maintaining or increasing position in the Sindicato de Nuevo Mexico Gang (SNM), an enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, the defendants, **JOE LAWRENCE GALLEGOS**, **SANTOS GONZALEZ**, **PAUL RIVERA**, **SHAUNA**

Case 2:15-cr-04268-JB Document 1966 Filed 03/23/18 Page 27 of 61

GUTIERREZ and **BRANDY RODRIGUEZ**, did unlawfully, knowingly, and intentionally attempt to murder Jose Gomez, and committed assault with a dangerous weapon and assault resulting in serious bodily injury to Jose Gomez, in violation of NMSA 1978, §§ 30-2-1, 30-28-1, 30-3-2, 30-3-5, and 30-1-13.

All in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1959(a)(3) and 1959(a)(5) and 2.

Count 16

Tampering With a Witness, Victim or Informant by Physical Force or Threat

On or about February 27, 2016, in Valencia County, in the District of New Mexico, the defendants, **JOE LAWRENCE GALLEGOS**, **SANTOS GONZALEZ**, **PAUL RIVERA**, **SHAUNA GUTIERREZ** and **BRANDY RODRIGUEZ**, used or attempted to use physical force or the threat of physical force against Jose Gomez by assaulting Jose Gomez with a dangerous weapon with the intent to influence, delay, or prevent Jose Gomez from testifying against **JOE LAWRENCE GALLEGOS** in an official proceeding.

All in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1512(a)(2)(A) and 2.

United States v. DeLeon, et al (15-4268), Trial 1, Jury Instruction No. 22

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS

JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 22

March 23, 2018 (Doc. 1366) (modified)

UNITED STATES' PROPOSED

at 1, 23-27, 16

Case 2:15-cr-04268-JB Document 1966 Filed 03/23/18 Page 28 of 61

~~UNITED STATES' PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 21~~

What I have just read are the charges brought by the Grand Jury in the indictment.

Although the indictment refers to sixteen total defendants, ^(Mr.) Joe Lawrence Gallegos, ^(Mr.) Edward Troup, ^(Mr.) Billy Garcia, ^(Mr.) Allen Patterson, ^(Mr.) Christopher Chavez, ^(Mr.) Arturo Arnulfo Garcia, ^(Mr.) Andrew Gallegos, and ^(Mr.) Shauna Gutierrez are the only defendants who are on trial before you in this case. The other Defendants are not on trial at this time. You must base your verdict solely on the evidence received in this trial, and you are not to draw any inferences from the fact that other Defendants named in the indictment are not on trial before you today.

United States v. DeLeon, et al (15-4268), Trial 1, Jury Instruction No. 23, modified

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS

UNITED STATES'

PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 21

at @ 1, 28, ^{file} Mar 23, 2018 (Doc. 1966)
(modified)